



**UNIVERSIDAD PONTIFICIA COMILLAS**  
Facultad de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Degree in Translation and Interpreting

Final Degree Project

# Denotation and Connotation in Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump:

Discourse analysis of the 2016 presidential debates

Student: Markel Lezana Escribano

Director: Dr Susan Jeffrey Campbell

Madrid, 8<sup>th</sup> June 2017

## Index

List of Tables.....	i
1. Introduction .....	3
2. Theoretical Framework.....	5
2.1 Semantics.....	5
2.2 Discourse Analysis .....	9
2.2.1 Functional Discourse Analysis .....	9
2.2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis .....	10
2.2.3 Political Discourse Analysis.....	10
2.3 Pragmatics .....	10
2.4 Tools of Analysis.....	11
2.4.1 Functions of Language .....	11
2.4.2 Speech Acts .....	15
2.4.3 Figures of Speech: Metaphor, Irony and Euphemism .....	16
3. State of the Art.....	19
3.1 Discursive Profile of the Candidates .....	19
3.2 Post-truth Politics .....	20
3.3 A New Discourse? Antiglobalization Populism.....	21
3.4 The Role of the Internet.....	22
4. Method and Materials .....	24
5. Discussion and Analysis.....	26
5.1 Denotation and Connotation in Hillary Clinton .....	26
5.1.1 Functions of Language .....	26
5.1.1.1 Referential Function .....	26
5.1.1.2 Emotive Function .....	27
5.1.1.3 Conative Function .....	28
5.1.1.4 Poetic Function.....	29

5.1.2 Speech Acts .....	30
5.1.2.1 Indirect Speech Acts .....	30
5.1.2.2 Nonliteral Speech Acts .....	31
5.1.3 Figures of Speech .....	32
5.2 Denotation and Connotation in Donald Trump .....	32
5.2.1 Functions of Language .....	32
5.2.1.1 Referential Function .....	32
5.2.1.2 Emotive Function .....	33
5.2.1.3 Conative Function .....	33
5.2.1.4 Poetic Function .....	34
5.2.2 Speech Acts .....	36
5.2.2.1 Indirect Speech Acts .....	36
5.2.2.2 Nonliteral Speech Acts .....	37
5.2.3 Figures of Speech .....	37
5.3 Main findings and differences between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump .....	38
6. Conclusion .....	40
7. Bibliography .....	43
8. Appendices .....	47
8.1 Appendix 1: Origin of the Speech Fragments Used, in Order of Appearance .....	47

## List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of Analytical Tools .....	18
Table 2: Summary of Main Findings .....	39

## **1. Introduction**

The 2016 United States presidential election has been described as one of the most bitter, confrontational and divisive campaigns in US history. The result of the election on November 9 also brought a surprise for the international community: Donald Trump, a businessman with no former political experience and a knack for nationalistic and anti-establishment rhetoric, became the 45<sup>th</sup> President of the United States. It is generally agreed that the election has marked a turning point in US history, International Relations, campaign organization and discourse analysis. The election has also been plagued by accusations of candidates lying; as a result, both campaign-funded teams and civil society organizations have put into motion fact-checking mechanisms and programs in order to monitor the assertions and facts delivered by the two presidential candidates. Social media and the internet have also played an essential role during this presidential campaign. In addition, Donald Trump's speeches and victory can be framed within a rising international trend of anti-establishment and anti-globalization political alternatives.

For these reasons, we find it particularly interesting to analyze the discursive style the candidates have resorted to when it comes to luring citizens to cast a vote for them. In this research, we will focus on the candidates' use of connotation and denotation in their political discourse, which will be drawn from transcripts of face-to-face debates. Usually, speakers use both denotation and connotation so they can appeal to the rational and emotional perception of voters, respectively. Whereas denotation is used to provide objective facts about policy and the state of the country, connotation focuses on conveying additional and associated meanings and making the message more appealing, convincing, and easier to remember. Our analysis will mostly focus on linguistics, and we will set social and political aspects of discourse analysis aside. In order to narrow the subject of the research, we will aim at answering the following questions: Is Donald Trump's discourse more connotative than Hillary Clinton's? Is Hillary Clinton's discourse comparatively denotative?

This research is framed within the elaboration of a final project for the degree of Translation and Interpreting studies. Discourse analysis and political communication are disciplines that are related to translation and interpreting, since the degree embraces multidisciplinary subjects that range from linguistics, language skills and oratory to

culture and communication. Discourse analysis is also linked to politics and sociology, which is related to the researcher's other topic of interest and part of his joint degree, International Relations. Consequently, this research is an opportunity to put the knowledge attained during five years into practice.

This project will be composed of five chapters. Chapter 2 elaborates a theoretical framework where we define the most relevant concepts in the academic fields of discourse analysis, linguistics and semiotics; among those, we will choose which ones are most useful for the analysis of denotation and connotation in the candidates' speeches. In Chapter 3, we present the state of the art, which summarizes what political commentators and analysts have said about Hillary Clinton's and Donald Trump's speeches, and we will explain some electoral trends that constitute relevant topics for our research. In Chapter 4 we explain the methodology that we have used to pursue our analysis and we reflect on the limitations and weaknesses of the research. In Chapter 5 we proceed to analyze extracts from the candidates' public speeches and debates, and we draw attention to denotative and connotative elements that we find in them, through the identification of figures of speech and techniques that embody denotation or connotation, which we will have already explained in previous chapters. Finally, Chapter 6 will serve as a conclusion where we summarize the most important findings of the research and determine whether our initial hypothesis is confirmed, or rejected. In the final chapter, we will also comment on further research that could arise from our findings.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

In order to explore connotation and denotation in Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's presidential campaign speeches, this final project will focus on the theory, application and methods drawn from three different but interrelated disciplines: semantics, discourse analysis and pragmatics. These disciplines will provide us with an analytical framework that we will use in order to identify denotative and connotative elements in three speeches that we can later quantify and compare. In this chapter, we will describe theoretical concepts such as discourse analysis, semantics and pragmatics, and select the key tools that we will use in the analysis of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's political discourses.

### 2.1 Semantics

Semantics is a discipline of the philosophical theory of semiotics, which studies signs and symbols and how they relate to languages. It is also, together with phonology, morphology and syntax, a pillar of linguistics (Kratch, 2007). Semantics focuses on the relations between signs and the meaning they refer to and studies theories of denotation and connotation, that is to say the different types of meaning and purpose that specific words and constructions play out in language. The theory of semantics is also very closely related to the study of the language that political actors use "to achieve a desired effect on audience especially through the use of word with novel or dual meanings"<sup>1</sup>.

In order to identify the different meanings in language constructions, the discipline of semantics explores and studies the relationship between two elements: the signifier and signified. The signifier is "the symbol, sound or image that represents and underlying concept or meaning"<sup>2</sup>, which in political discourse will mainly consist of a word or a structure of words. The signified is the object or concept associated to the signifier, that is to say the meaning of the word or structure of words. Signifiers may have signifieds of two different types: a denotative signified and a connotative signified (Cobley and Jansz, 1999). At the same time, each signifier or word may have several denotative signifieds and various connotative signifieds.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dictionary definitions have been extracted from the online version of the Merriam-Webster dictionary, available at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

On the one hand, a denotative signified corresponds to the literal and obvious meaning of words, sentences and texts. Language is used denotatively in order to provide an objective explanation or description of reality. The denotative relation between signifier and signified is also referred to as a “word-to-world relationship” (Gumperz, 2001, p. 216), given that the word is a representation of the object or concept that we find in reality. Generally, the denotative meanings of a signifier are those we can find in a dictionary. On the other hand, words and structures of words which have a connotative signified incorporate subjective meaning in addition to the literal meaning of words themselves (Cobley and Jansz, 1999). Connotative meanings usually transmit ideas related to ideologies and emotions. These associated meanings are sociocultural and personal, as we will explain later.

To give an example, we can analyze some of the different possible signifieds that we find in the signifier ‘marriage’. The denotative signifieds of the word ‘marriage’ can include “the state of being united as spouses in a consensual and contractual relationship recognized by law”, or “an act of marrying, or the rite by which the married status is effected”<sup>3</sup>, to mention a few. In addition, the word ‘marriage’ has an array of associated meanings that will depend on the intention of the speaker and the context in which the word is used. Associated or connotative meanings related to the word ‘marriage’ range from the positive (happiness, fulfillment, love) to the negative (obligation, burden, mistake).

Initially, semiotics theorists such as Saussure constructed models that gave priority to denotation over connotation (Chandler, 1995), but later other authors such as Barthes (1974) confronted this view and argued that all denotative meanings were in themselves tinted by connotation:

Denotation is not the first meaning, but pretends to be so; under this illusion, it is ultimately no more than the last of the connotations [...], the superior myth by which the text pretends to return to the nature of language, to language as nature. (p. 9)

Simply put, Barthes argued that the denotative meaning is no other than a connotation in itself that, through a process of ‘naturalization’, has been established as the primary meaning which is considered as literal, objective and non-ideological. Hence, a

---

<sup>3</sup> Definition retrieved from the online version of the Merriam-Webster dictionary.



particular connotation falsely becomes a denotation and is regarded as such through social convention and dominant views. As a result, the learning of signs and dominant meanings through language and education implies a positioning “within ideology by learning dominant connotations” (Chandler, 1995).

Leaving the critical analysis of the connotation and denotation concepts aside, it is important to notice that usually every signifier will have both denotative and connotative meanings, given that the mere use of a particular word instead of an alternative implies certain connotations. Even though connotation and denotation express different meanings, they usually coexist in every word. As Chandler (1995) puts it:

[W]hilst theorists may find it analytically useful to distinguish connotation from denotation, in practice such meanings cannot be neatly separated. Most semioticians argue that no sign is purely denotative - lacking connotation. [...] There can be no neutral, objective description which is free of an evaluative element. (p. 4)

In addition to the basic semantic distinction of denotative and connotative meaning, other authors have emphasized the importance of other elements of discourse that add meaning to words and word structures. According to Halliday’s vision of semantics, one of the most relevant aspects to take into account is the textual meaning of words and constructions, in addition to denotative or referential and connotative or expressive meanings (Halliday, 1977). The textual meaning refers to the choices the speaker has made when uttering and constructing sentences in a text or a speech. These choices aim to organize the discourse and control the flow of the text. Therefore, Halliday’s approach gives importance to the meaning found in context, text structure and the choices made by the speaker. This is particularly important when analyzing political discourse because the choice of words and sentences is meticulously planned so that it will have a greater impact on the audience. Speakers in political discourse organize their texts and connect their different parts in particular ways so that they can stress key concepts and ideas that they want to emphasize and construct messages in catchy and appealing ways for the audience.

Bloomfield’s behaviorist analysis of meaning focuses on language as an action and the addressee in communication. He believed that meaning includes “the situation in which a speaker utters and the response it calls forth in a hearer” (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 139).

According to this approach, meaning is closely related to the intention and purpose of the speaker as well as to the interpretation and reaction of the receiver. For behaviorists, if the meaning and reaction intended by the speaker reach the addressee in a way that his or her response is the one intended by the addressor, then the meaning has been effectively conveyed and the purpose fulfilled. The behaviorist approach is closely related to the interaction of semantics and pragmatics, which will be analyzed later in this section.

Another aspect that we need to take into account in the study of semantics is the fact that language meaning is contextual and strongly influenced by historical, cultural and economic factors (Cobley and Jansz, 1999). The denotative and connotative meanings of the word 'marriage', to continue with the example we have already used, have evolved dramatically throughout history, and they vary in each culture. In many Western countries, the word 'marriage' had a more limited definition or denotative meaning in the past, but now the concept is often broader because in some countries marriages can be religious, civil, heterosexual and homosexual. Connotative meanings have also changed, since 'marriage' is currently associated with a later phase or age in life, if we compare it with the associated meaning of marriage to an earlier age several decades ago. Similarly, the word 'marriage' has very different denotative and connotative meaning across cultures. The meaning of language also depends on the participants in the communication act, since different people may associate different meanings to certain words (e.g. democracy, justice, politics, equality) depending on their own personal experience, ideology and beliefs but also on class, age, gender or ethnicity (Chandler, 1995).

When it comes to political discourse, the participants of communication acts often resort to constructing discourse that is full of denotative and connotative meaning. In fact, appealing to both reason and emotion are effective when it comes to persuading, shaping ideas, and causing a reaction in the audience, as psychological and cognitive research has found (Edwards and Potter, 1992). The strength of denotation and connotation for persuasion has also been studied in the fields of advertising and marketing (Fuentes and Alcaide, 2002). Ultimately, political discourses always constitute some kind of political advertising in which persuasion is the primary objective. For the reasons given, connotation and denotation are essential in political discourse.

## **2.2 Discourse Analysis**

Discourse analysis is the discipline that studies language in use. Discourse analysis attempts at signaling commonalities beyond the unit of the text, so it focuses on broader subjects such as text typologies and genres, authors, fields, ideologies or topics (Schäffner, 2013). In this project, discourse analysis will focus on finding commonalities and differences in the discourse pertaining to two particular authors: the 2016 US presidential candidates Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. In addition to linguistic aspects, discourse analysis focuses on the study of the participants and the context in which the discourse takes place. Discourse analysis is a multidisciplinary discipline in which the methods of analysis vary “depending on the objectives of the investigation” (Schäffner, 2013, p. 48). Initially studied and developed within the fields of linguistics, anthropology and philosophy, discourse analysis was soon developed in other disciplines such as history, communication, psychology, sociology and artificial intelligence; thus discourse analysis incorporated analytical methods from these new domains (Schiffrin, Tannen and Hamilton, 2001). Three of the main approaches that are used when analyzing political discourse are functional discourse analysis (FDA), critical discourse analysis (CDA) and political discourse analysis (PDA).

### **2.2.1 Functional Discourse Analysis**

Functionalism and its several branches –functional grammar, lexical functional grammar and systemic functional linguistics– prioritize language functions (use and purpose of language) over language structure (composition and organization of textual elements). Functionalism has a strictly linguistic component that studies “grammatical and other functional relations of textual structures or strategies” and a cross-disciplinary component that “analyzes the functional relations between these textual structures and various structures of the context” (Van Dijk, n.d., p. 27). Functionalism, which has been elaborated by authors like Halliday, Van Dijk, Meyer and Steiner, among others, focuses on “grammatical, [...] phonological, syntactic, or semantic description, [and] pragmatic, stylistic, rhetorical or superstructural” analysis (Van Dijk, n.d., p. 29). Some elements of functional analysis such as those related to semantics, pragmatics and rhetoric will prove useful in the analysis of connotation and denotation in Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump’s speeches.

### **2.2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis**

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a discipline that regards discourse as a social practice and focuses on studying the representation of power and social inequality in discourse (Schäffner, 2013). Critical discourse analysis therefore analyzes the manifestation of particular topics and ideas (such as populism, feminism, racism, power or struggle) in discourse. The purpose of theory is different, too. According to Wodak and Meyer (2008), critical discourse analysis is “oriented towards critiquing and changing society as a whole, in contrast to traditional theory oriented solely to understanding or explaining it” (p. 6). Although this theoretical approach could be used to study broad topics such as gender, racism, poverty and populism in Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump’s speeches, CDA pursues an analysis at a more macro level than the kind of analysis we are interested in. This approach, which mainly looks at “a broad conglomeration of linguistic and nonlinguistic social practices and ideological assumptions that together construct power or racism” (Schiffrin et al., 2001, p. 1) is not so useful in looking at connotation and denotation at a micro level.

### **2.2.3 Political Discourse Analysis**

Political discourse analysis is a discipline that is concerned with discourses that take place within political contexts and which are pronounced by political actors such as “politicians, political institutions, governments, political media, and political supporters operating in political environments to achieve political goals” (Wilson, 2001, p. 398). One of the primary goals of political discourse analysis is to find out which linguistic and rhetorical strategies are used and how the language choices that are made in order to attain a particular political effect (Wilson, 2001, p. 410). Political discourse analysis takes a look specifically at lexical choice (connotation, euphemism, and loaded words), use of functional systems in different ideologies, use of pronouns and how they are used to describe the responsibility of political actors, and some other discursive elements such as metaphors and speech acts (Wilson, 2001, p. 411).

## **2.3 Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is the field of linguistics that studies the aspects of meaning that are not captured by semantic theory. Pragmatics brings our attention to the fact that language does not simply consist of uttering true or false statements, since speakers also have an

intention when speaking and want to accomplish something with language; in fact, the speakers hope to have an effect on the listener who might reciprocate the intention of the speaker through an action (Chandler, 1995). In fact, all discourse is directed to an audience and has the purpose of having an effect on the audience or the interpreters. Ultimately, the speaker wants the listener to react as he or she expects them to. If semantics is “the relation of signs to what they stand for”, pragmatics is “the relation of signs to interpreters” (Morris, 1970, pp. 6-7). One of the first theories in pragmatics is the speech act theory developed by John L. Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969). These authors wrote about the importance of the performative purpose of language, that is to say, the purpose of doing things with language. As a result of Austin and Searle’s contributions to linguistics through pragmatics and speech acts theory, semantic theory started to incorporate speaker intentions and audience responses as fields of study of its own (Norrick, 2001). In political discourse, candidates perform multiple speech acts: informing, requesting, warning, declaring, refuting, denying, promising, etc. Nevertheless, the ultimate performative purposes of political communication are for the audience and particularly for voters to believe what the candidates are saying, identify with their views and ideas, and finally voting for and supporting the candidate when elections arrive.

## **2.4 Tools of Analysis**

As we have already mentioned, when it comes to analyzing discourse, the method and tools that we use will depend on the topic we are studying. For the study of semantics, and particularly the distinction of denotative and connotative elements, some of the tools that researchers often use are functions of language in use, speech acts and figures of speech. The analysis of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump’s speeches will mostly identify and analyze different functions of language but it will also include a brief commentary on speech acts and figures of speech that are particularly useful to measure connotation.

### **2.4.1 Functions of Language**

Functions of language are analytical tools that will allow us to identify what language is used for in discourse. For the purpose of this project, we will focus on the functions of language that make a distinction between connotative and denotative elements of language. One of the earliest theories of functionalism was the one outlined by Roman

Jakobson (1984) in his essay *Linguistics and poetics*. Jakobson identified six elements of communication (sender, receiver, message, context, channel and code) and six functions that were associated to each of these elements: the referential function, the emotive function, the conative function, the phatic function, the metalingual function and the poetic function.

The referential or denotative function is related to the context of the communication act. The referential function conveys the literal meaning of what is being expressed and describes the subject the speaker is referring to. The referential function is present at every instance where language is used to provide objective information about reality. In political discourse, the referential function is used in order to appeal to the reason of the audience, as in the following sentence: “During the Obama administration over 500,000 jobs have been created and for that reason today we have the lowest unemployment rate in 5 years”. The referential function can be identified with the denotative meaning since it serves for conveying objective and literal information about reality.

The emotive function refers to the feelings, emotions and attitude that the sender holds in respect of the topic he or she is speaking about. Such emotions can be genuine or false. According to Jakobson, the emotive function is most visible in elements of non-verbal language like interjections and intonation. In political discourse, the emotive function is used in order to appeal to the emotions of the audience, to show empathy, to identify with voters and to portray certain attributes and values of the speaker. An example of the emotive function is: “It deeply saddens me the situation of the families that cannot access medical services because they can’t afford it”. The emotive function is connotative because the receiver could infer from the feeling expressed that the sender is willing to do something about the situation he or she believes it is sad.

The conative function is related to the receiver in the communicative act; its most common manifestations are the imperative tense and vocatives. In political discourse, the conative function is used for implicating and convincing the audience, as in this example: “You Americans should really think whether during the next four years you want to be led by someone who lied to all of us”. The conative function brings out the behaviorist conception of meaning as being related to speaker intentions and the calling for a response in the hearer.

The phatic function is linked to the channel, and it is used to regulate the interaction between participants, begin or end communication, and to make sure that the channel is open. In political discourse, the phatic function is used to manage turn taking and to attract the attention of the audience, as in: “I’m sorry, I haven’t finished, let me just say something else”. The phatic function is related to the textual meaning as expressed by Halliday, since it is used to regulate the flow of the discourse.

The metalingual function refers to the code in the communicative act and it is used to talk about language itself: language is described and analyzed through language. It is useful to make sure that sender and receiver are using the same code. In political discourse, speakers resort to the metalingual function to explain concepts that can be unknown to the audience or to express the interpretation that the speaker makes of a certain concept, as in the following sentence: “I believe that equality is about providing the same opportunities for everyone regardless of race, gender or social status”. In political discourse the metalingual function might be denotative or connotative, since the addressor might explain the literal meaning of a word or concept or his or her own interpretation of a particular concept.

The poetic function relates to the message in the communicative act and it consists of how the message is shaped more than on how the content is delivered. Through the poetic function language manipulates the aesthetic dimension of the message. In political discourse, the poetic function is used to make a message appealing, convincing, striking and even easier to remember. This effect is achieved through figures of speech such as metaphor, anaphora, paronomasia, hyperbole, irony, alliteration and oxymoron, among others. The following example contains a metaphor: “America must be the flame that leads the liberal world and guide us through dark times”. The poetic function is highly connotative because it shapes the message in ways that convey associated meanings that are useful for attaining the purpose of the speaker.

When it comes to the analysis of denotative and connotative elements, we observe that the referential function is closely related to denotation, whereas the emotive, conative, poetic and metalingual functions are linked to connotation due to their expressing of additional meanings beyond the objective and literal meaning of words and structures themselves. The phatic function acts as a regulator of conversation, and in the political debates that we are going to analyze is mostly performed by the moderator.

In the discipline of systemic functional analysis, Halliday (2004) identifies a different series of functions or metafunctions: the ideational function, the interpersonal function and the textual function. The ideational function of language refers to the fact that language is used to construe human experience and represent information about our surrounding. The interpersonal function of language means that language is used by humans in relation to other humans, and therefore “language is [...] enacting: enacting our personal and social relationships with the other people around us” (Halliday, 2004, p. 29). Finally, the textual function is present when language for structural purposes or to “build up sequences of discourse, organizing the discursive flow and creating cohesion and continuity as it moves along” (Halliday, 2004, p. 30). The distinction of denotative and connotative elements in Halliday’s functions is not as clear as in Jakobson’s functions. For instance, the expression of human experience and the representation of information of the outer world –that corresponds to the ideational function– can be performed using both denotative and connotative elements; Halliday does not specify whether the information given through the ideational function is objective or subjective. Similarly, the interpersonal and textual functions give us little information about the content of the message and the way it is delivered. Consequently, we observe that the metafunctions described by Halliday have a broader scope than those of Jakobson; thus, we will not use them to discern denotative and connotative elements in Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton’s speeches.

In his study of discourse and context, Van Dijk (2012) considered that it is important to take into account a new series of functions other than the three proposed by Halliday. Van Dijk adds a cultural function, which defines cultural identities; a social function for group identities and institutional activities; a normative function that expresses the meaning of values and norms; an ideological function for the promotion of the interests of a group that shares a certain ideology; an emotional function for the expression of feeling and emotions; an intrapersonal function that relates to each speaker’s own identity, and many others like the poetic and artistic functions. Van Dijk’s functions also do not distinguish between denotative and connotative elements; therefore, for practical purposes, we will focus on the original six functions as outlined by Roman Jakobson.



## 2.4.2 Speech Acts

According to Austin (1962), all communicative acts are performative; hence, language use always involves an action. Every time speakers make an utterance, such actions are performed at three levels which take place at the same time. The first level is the locutionary act, which consists of making an utterance or expressing an idea through words. The second level is the illocutionary act, which represents the profound meaning of the utterance, which depends on the intention of the speaker and has to be interpreted by the receiver of the message. Finally, there is a perlocutionary act, which constitutes the effect that the locutionary and illocutionary acts have on the receivers and the response that the utterance triggers in them, which may be the one intended by the speaker, or a different one. For example, when the library speaker announces that “the library will close in fifteen minutes”, the locutionary act in that utterance is the sentence that has been pronounced. The illocutionary act or the profound message of the utterance is to inform the people that the library will be closing soon and also to urge those using the library services that they should finish what they are doing and start heading towards the exit. The perlocutionary act of the sentence would be the effect that it has on those to whom the message is directed: they should decide to collect their belongings and they should exit the library within fifteen minutes.

The performative nature of speech acts can be explicit or implicit in the utterance (Bach, 2002). Often, the locutionary act and the illocutionary act can have different or even opposite meanings. For semantical purposes and for the identification of denotation and connotation, it is relevant to notice that “we can perform a speech act (1) directly or indirectly, by way of performing another speech act [and] (2) literally or nonliterally, depending on how we are using our words” (Bach, 2002). Speech acts are direct when the locutionary and illocutionary levels coincide. In direct acts, the speaker declares his intention directly: “Pass me the water, please”. At both locutionary and illocutionary levels the speaker is requesting the receiver to pass the water. When an illocutionary act is expressed indirectly, another illocutionary act is performed directly instead: “I’m so thirsty”. In this case, at the locutionary level the speaker is declaring that he or she is thirsty, but at the illocutionary level he or she could be requesting someone to pass the water. Similarly, in the cases where the speech act is not performed literally, the receiver of the message will not be able to understand the real meaning of the illocutionary act only from the words used in the utterance (Bach, 2002). Examples of

nonliteral speech acts are: “my head was in the clouds” or “get lost!” In both indirect speech acts and nonliteral speech acts, context is necessary to understand the true illocutionary act intended by the speaker. For that reason, indirect and nonliteral speech acts are closely related to connotation; they include associated meanings that are not directly visible in the words uttered by the speaker.

### **2.4.3 Figures of Speech: Metaphor, Irony and Euphemism**

Figures of speech are stylistic devices that are used in rhetoric and oratory to make messages aesthetically pleasing, more convincing, emotionally loaded, visual or even just simpler to understand. Some figures of speech are particularly connotative and also very frequently resorted to in political speechwriting. In this final degree project we are going to focus on three figures: irony, metaphor and euphemism.

Irony is a rhetoric tool that can be defined as utterances whose literal meaning expresses the opposite of what the speaker intends to say (Booth, 1974). Simply put, in an ironic expression the meaning intended is different to the literal meaning of words. By this definition, one finds that irony is closely related to connotation. Furthermore, irony can be regarded as an indirect speech act, since the locutionary act and illocutionary act in an ironic utterance have different and, in fact, opposite meanings. In an example used in an interpreting class, we observed that a teacher is being ironic, for instance, when a student hands in a three-page essay even when the teacher had asked for a fifteen-page essay and the teacher says: “Oh, wow! You’ve really worked hard!” The teacher is being ironic, since even if literally her words seem to recognize the student’s hard work, her actual intention is to say that the student has not worked enough.

Metaphor is also a connotative figure of speech “in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them”<sup>4</sup>. Metaphors are part of the poetic function of language and they mostly have persuasive and aesthetical purposes. In political discourse, metaphors are used for the message to have a greater impact in the audience or in order to explain complex issues in a simple way. Metaphors like “grassroots movements”, “melting pot” and “soft power” have become mainstream concepts in American politics. In order to understand metaphors, we must pay attention to the connotative meaning of the words that are used in them.

---

<sup>4</sup> Definition retrieved from the online version of the Merriam-Webster dictionary.

Euphemism is a figure that consists of “the substitution of an agreeable or inoffensive expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant”<sup>5</sup>. This figure of speech is particularly connotative because speakers choose to pronounce a particular word owing to the fact that its connotations are more positive than an alternative word or expression. In political discourse, euphemism is often used to avoid negative ideas, be politically correct and avoid explicitly stating something that endangers the politician’s political goals. There are many examples of euphemism. Politicians often talk about the “less advantaged” instead of the “poor” or they prefer to say that the country is experiencing a period of “negative growth” instead of a “contraction” or “recession”. Montgomery (1992) drew our attention to the highly euphemistic language of nuclear weapons and dehumanization of language:

Strategic nuclear weapon – large nuclear bomb of immense destructive power.  
Tactical nuclear weapon – small nuclear weapon of immense destructive power.  
Enhanced radiation weapon – neutron bomb (destroys people not property).  
Demographic targeting – killing the civilian population. (p. 179)

In the description of nuclear weapons, speakers are using technical and neutral language to hide the horrible consequences of deploying the weapons they are mentioning. The connotations in the euphemisms they are pronouncing portray an impression of scientifically and strategically proven and justified actions. The connotations of ‘demographic targeting’ are more neutral than if the speaker was to state that they are going to kill civilians in an attack.

---

<sup>5</sup> Definition retrieved from the online version of the Merriam-Webster dictionary.

## 2.5 Table 1: Summary of Analytical Tools

In the following table, we summarize and describe the thirteen analytical tools that we have developed in the theoretical framework chapter, and we indicate whether these tools will help us when it comes to identifying denotation or connotation in the political discourse transcripts that we will later analyze.

<b>Tools</b>	<b>Concept</b>	<b>Description/use</b>	<b>Semantic association</b>
<b>Functions of language (Roman Jakobson)</b>	Referential	Describing reality; literal meaning.	Denotation
	Emotive	Conveying the speaker's feeling and emotions	Connotation
	Conative	Implicating the receivers	Connotation
	Metalingual	Explaining language through language	Denotation or connotation
	Poetic	Delivering an aesthetically pleasing message	Connotation
	Phatic	Regulating communication	None
<b>Speech acts</b>	Literal speech act	Illocutionary act perceivable through words	Denotation
	Nonliteral speech act	Illocutionary act not perceivable through words	Connotation
	Direct speech act	Locutionary and illocutionary levels coincide	Denotation
	Indirect speech act	Locutionary and illocutionary levels do not coincide	Connotation
<b>Figures of speech</b>	Irony	Intention of the speaker is the opposite to the literal meaning of the utterance	Connotation
	Metaphor	Replacing a word for another one with different denotation but similar connotation	Connotation
	Euphemism	Substitution of word with negative connotation by word with positive or neutral connotation	Connotation

### **3. State of the Art**

#### **3.1 Discursive Profile of the Candidates**

During the campaign trail, political commentators and discourse analysts have attempted to identify the main features of the 2016 United States presidential candidates in terms of their profiles as speakers. Generally, they have made assumptions that are also perceived by the wider audience and voters. The following are only some common generalizations that have been written about Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's speeches.

On the one hand, the Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton has mostly been portrayed as a speaker who stresses the importance of objective facts, logical argumentation, management of detail and profound knowledge of public policy (The Economist, April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016). Her discursive style is clearly influenced and nourished by her multiple years as a public servant, during which she served as Secretary of State, Member of the Senate and First Lady of the United States. This has contributed to the audience regarding her as a mainstream politician, or an 'insider' of the political establishment (The Boston Globe, 2016), a term that within the context of the 2016 elections could entail both positive and negative connotations. Some people believe that such years of experience make her the fittest candidate to lead the United States, whereas others despise the fact that she is an establishment figure since they regard politicians in Washington as distant leaders that are not only not aware of the real concerns of their constituents, but also lie to them. In comparison to her rival, Hillary Clinton conveyed a relatively positive image of the current situation of the US. She stressed concepts like hope, going forward and the continuity of the Obama legacy (The Economist, April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016). Hillary Clinton was successful at convincing minorities and urban and young populations, but was unable to appeal to a white audience, older people and blue-collar workers in the Rust Belt States (Tyson & Maniam, 2016).

On the other hand, the Republican candidate and currently President Donald Trump has been described as direct, confrontational, vague in terms of policy outlining and free of the rhetorical and "deceitful" style of mainstream politicians (The Economist, May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016). Political analysts have identified that Trump's political discourse is full of "banner" messages, i.e. short and concise phrases that appear to encapsulate a particular ideological positioning to which voters can associate a series of unspecified policies

(The Economist, May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016). Some famous examples include “Build the wall” (relating to immigration policy towards Latin America), “Drain the swamp” (clearing politics of establishment politicians), “Make America great again” (a distancing from Obama’s multilateralism by stressing America-first trade policy, military policy and redesigning some of the American alliances) and “Lock her up” (pressing charges against Hillary Clinton due to her involvement in an e-mail scandal). In his speech, he has also signaled institutions, countries and social groups that he considers as America’s foes: immigrants, China, establishment politicians, the liberal media and certain individuals. In addition to this, his discourse has elements from his background as a businessman, and therefore voters consider him an outsider in terms of the political establishment. Finally, Donald Trump emphasized his negative view of America and stressed concepts like change and American exceptionalism (The Economist, May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016). These features, says Noam Chomsky, make Trump’s speech similar to that of dictators and authoritarian leaders of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Sharman, 2016; Open Culture, 2016). Donald Trump was very successful at attracting the vote of white people, less educated citizens, inland and southern States and blue-collar workers (Tyson and Maniam, 2016).

### **3.2 Post-truth Politics**

The electoral year where Clinton and Trump battled for the US presidency was also the year that Oxford Dictionaries declared ‘post-truth’ to be word of the year. According to the institution, post-truth is an adjective for things “relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief” (Oxford Dictionary, 2016). In fact, the year 2016 and the US presidential campaign have been marked by the importance of what voters believe to be the truth over what is generally accepted or proven to actually be the truth.

Post-truth politics has multiple implications for the study of semiotics, connotation and denotation. First, subjectivity in discourse can be perceived as objective only because the receiver believes it to be the truth; thus, the line between connotation and denotation is blurred. Second, connotation and denotation are not so focused on speaker intentions but on the interpretation of the audience. Third, lies can be communicated as if they were literal and objective representations of the truth.

Political commentators have pointed to Mr. Trump as a manifestation of post-truth politics, given that he shows “a reliance on assertions that ‘feel true’ but have no basis in fact” (The Economist, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016). There is an argument stating that the art of lying is nothing new, and for many people there is the common perception that politicians lie and do not fulfill their promises. As columnist Simon Jenkins (2017) puts it, “suppressing truth and suggesting falsehood have been leitmotifs of politics since time began”. Politicians are in fact skilled in the use of denotative figures such as metaphor and euphemism to hide the truth, sugarcoat bad news or exaggerate personal achievements. Donald Trump has used the perceived lack of honesty of politicians in his favor, making him look trustworthy and honest.

The fact that Donald Trump makes use of post-truth politics methods was almost directly confirmed by Kellyanne Conway, a chief advisor to the Trump campaign, when she voiced that Mr. Trump’s team aimed at providing “alternative facts” (Swaine, 2017). In fact, post-truth politics is becoming an increasingly useful way for political actors to “fashion their personal narratives” and make people agree and adopt them as their own, a trend that is helped by “a collapse in belief that there is a single, shared version of the truth”, says David Rennie (2017), writing in *The Economist*. “Too often, today’s political opponents do not just disagree, they express disbelief”, Rennie adds.

### **3.3 A New Discourse? Antiglobalization Populism**

In addition to post-truth politics, there is a new kind of politics and discourse on the rise: antiglobalization populism (The Economist, October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016). Although this project aims at analyzing denotative and connotative elements in the discourses of two specific politicians, the discipline of discourse analysis –and particularly critical discourse analysis– is often employed to study the use of language relative to a specific topic or ideology (Schäffner, 2013). Whereas Hillary Clinton’s speeches have been regarded as continuing President Barack Obama’s legacy, Donald Trump’s speeches could be framed in a new type of political discourse. Even if Trump defends that he mirrors some preceding presidents like Ronald Reagan, few Republican candidates, or none, have ever turned their backs on liberalization of the world economy and multiculturalism on the same scale that Donald Trump has in the electoral campaign. This trend is not only visible in the United States. Consequently, it will be the role of discourse analysis to study the features and trends of the current populist and alt-right

speeches and its recurring themes: xenophobia, globalization, nationalism and trade war.

In a further investigation, it would be very interesting to analyze common features and differences of Donald Trump's speeches in relation to populist and nationalist discourse elsewhere in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. His antiglobalization discourse could be compared across countries by pursuing a comparative cross-cultural analysis. For instance, his speeches could be compared with those of ruling European leaders such as Russian President Vladimir Putin, Polish Prime Minister Beata Szydlo and her Hungarian counterpart Viktor Orban, or presidential hopefuls like Gert Wilders in the Netherlands, Frauke Petry in Germany and Marine Le Pen in France. The current populist and nationalist trends could also be compared with similar nationalist speeches from different eras; for example, the interwar era in 20<sup>th</sup> century Europe, a time of rising nationalism.

### **3.4 The Role of the Internet**

In a political era dominated by post-truth politics and populist discourse, experts have stressed the role of internet when it comes to scrutinizing, monitoring or supporting the ideas that politicians convey in their speeches (Washington Post, 2016; New York Times, 2016). In the United States, most of the 2016 political debates, speeches and rallies have been monitored by online fact-checking webpages; hence, the internet community seems to be more responsible than ever for unveiling the truth. For that reason, even though through the Internet lies can spread quickly and to large numbers of people, they can also be publicly exposed in the same manner (Jenkins, 2017).

Nevertheless, the internet has also played a role in perpetuating dubious activities such as the dissemination of fake news, which would not have been possible without the increasing relevance of social media (Rainie, Anderson & Albright, 2017). Research has found that there is an alarming increase in the number of people whose only news source is Facebook or a similar social network (Mitchell, Gottfried, Barthel & Shearer, 2016). Even if fake news and lies can be publicly exposed, mathematical algorithms that aim to maximize the number of views and interaction in advertising and social media result in consumers receiving information and news from sources and points of view that they already like and support, making those they disagree with less visible. As in post-truth politics dynamics, those who receive fake news and biased articles accept



them as truthful and objective for the sole reason that they agree with them and feel like they should be true.

#### 4. Method and Materials

For the elaboration of our analysis, we have identified a series of rhetoric and oratory strategies that embody either denotative or connotative elements. In a previous chapter, we have summarized the findings of scholars who have studied semiotics and discourse analysis, and we have found that the elements within three fields of study in linguistics –functions of language, figures of speech and speech acts– will prove useful for the purpose of identifying denotation and connotation in political speech<sup>6</sup>. In the discussion and analysis chapter we will identify the aforesaid denotative and connotative elements in three texts that derive from speeches delivered during the 2016 presidential campaign. Our material will be five transcripts of speeches given by the presidential candidates Hilary Clinton and Donald Trump. All of the transcripts we have used are available online on the webpage of the *Politico* magazine, which has also made several analyses of the speeches of its own. These three transcripts consist of three face-to-face presidential debates, which took place on September 26<sup>th</sup>, October 9<sup>th</sup> and October 19<sup>th</sup>. The main reason behind the choice of these speeches is their repercussion in the American public opinion and media, since they were among the most viewed speeches during the presidential campaign. Alas, all of these texts are too long to analyze in a single final year degree research project. Therefore, we will take a closer look at the following parts of the texts: the opening and closing statements, the turn-taking dynamics and two topics that were particularly relevant during the election: the American healthcare system and the direction of the economy. Since the speeches of the candidates are timed, especially in the face-to-face debates, the fragments that will be analyzed for each candidate will be of a similar length. Nevertheless, we will draw attention to other fragments of the discourse when we believe its significance is relevant for our research. Once we have identified denotative and connotative elements, we will compare our findings in each of the speakers, and we will try to answer the following question: who of the two candidates has displayed more connotative elements in the texts we have analyzed?

Before we begin the analysis, we start from an initial hypothesis. On the one hand, we expect Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton to have been more denotative in her discourse given her many years of background as a public servant where objective and detailed discussion of policy is essential. On the other hand, we expect to find more

---

<sup>6</sup> For a summary of the strategies, see Table 1 on page 18.

connotative elements in Republican candidate, and current President, Donald Trump, an inclination that could be related to his background in business, entrepreneurship and entertainment television.

The main limitation of this research project is the lack of time to process all the discourses available and to use the multiple disciplines in discourse analysis that would cast light on the topic. As a result of narrowing the material analyzed to only five out of dozens of public appearances, there exists the possibility that the extracts chosen will not reflect the broader and true features of the speakers, in contrast to the findings one would get when a larger amount of texts is examined. It is possible that in the material chosen either of the candidates is portrayed as more or less connotative than they generally are. Candidates could be better prepared in certain topics because they are important to his or her voters, and therefore he or she could have elaborated a wider and wittier way to refer to these topics in ways that are appealing, clever and attractive to voters through the use of connotation. For that reason, a further analysis of other fragments of the material chosen or even different speeches, interviews and press conferences where the candidates participated is recommended in order to obtain more varied and reliable findings.

## 5. Discussion and Analysis

### 5.1 Denotation and Connotation in Hillary Clinton

Pundits have described Hillary Clinton as an experienced establishment candidate who excels at thoroughly delineating the policies that she wants to implement as a President of the United States. Therefore, we expect her to often be denotative when it comes to objectively describing policies and providing information about the state of the country. When expressing connotations, we expect her to be comparatively optimistic about the position of the United States and the leadership of President Barack Obama until 2016.

#### 5.1.1 Functions of Language

As we have already mentioned in the theoretical framework chapter, some functions of language are particularly related to either denotation –the referential function– or connotation –the emotive, conative and poetic functions. In the following paragraphs, we will analyze these four functions as described by Roman Jakobson in Hillary Clinton’s and Donald Trump’s discourse, and later we will compare our findings in each of them. In the transcripts analyzed, we have not found significant examples regarding metalingual and phatic functions that are worth mentioning.

##### 5.1.1.1 Referential Function

When it comes to the referential function, we have found that Mrs. Clinton often uttered plainly referential sentences when referring to policies, her personal and work lives, the state of the American economy and events that occurred in the past. In laying out policies she explained that her political plan focused on creating “*jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business*”. When talking about her background, she described her father’s job by saying that “[h]e printed drapery fabrics on long tables, where he pulled out those fabrics and he went down with a silkscreen and dumped the paint in and took the squeegee and kept going” and she talked about her several years of experience as a public servant: “*I was in the Senate before I became secretary of state*”. Notably, Hillary used the referential function when speaking about past events and the evolution of the American economy. She was referential when talking about the impact of the economic crisis (“*Nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their homes. And \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out.*”); discussing the policies and

achievements of Barack Obama and her husband Bill Clinton as Presidents of the United States (“*When my husband was president, we went from a \$300 billion deficit to a \$200 billion surplus*”; “[*Obama*] *has cut the deficit by two-thirds*”), and when underlining key aspects relating to how the economy had changed in the last few years: “*We are not dependent on the Middle East, but the Middle East controls a lot of prices*”; “*the price of coal is down worldwide*”; “*We're beginning to see some increase in incomes*”; “*Right now we are at 90% health insurance coverage*”.

In addition, Hillary Clinton was particularly referential and therefore denotative when talking about healthcare. First of all, it is worth mentioning that when debating about the current healthcare system, she would mostly refer to it as the Affordable Care Act, and only once as Obamacare. She might have preferred to use the legal document’s official name instead of the more popular Obamacare name in order to prevent the audience from associating what she was saying to the then President Barack Obama. When talking about healthcare, in general she objectively described the provisions of the healthcare law and compared them to the situation before the Affordable Care Act was passed. She actually enumerated a series of the policies contained in the act:

*insurance companies can't deny you coverage because of a preexisting condition [...], women can't be charged more than men for our health insurance, which is the way it used to be before the affordable care act [and] if you are under 26 and your parents have a policy, you can be on that policy until the age of 26, something that didn't happen before.*

She also denotatively described the healthcare system when she said that in the United States there is “*an employer-based system: that’s where the vast majority of people get their health care*”.

#### **5.1.1.2 Emotive Function**

When it comes to the emotive function, we have not found many examples where Mrs. Clinton explicitly talks about her own feelings, but she has expressed that her approach to the next four years if she were to be elected President would be optimistic: “*I have a positive and optimistic view of what we can do together*”. Moreover, we have found that Hillary Clinton makes constant remarks to family and her role as a mother and grandmother, which aims at portraying an image of her being caring, responsible and thoughtful. This way, not only does she express her emotions, but she also does it implicitly through mentioning the family, which the audience can identify with. This

strategy is particularly connotative. For instance, she highlighted that she thought a lot about America's youth and children by saying: *"Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this a lot"*. When laying out economic policies, she also often mentioned family: *"because those coal miners and their fathers and grandfathers"*; *"That's why I want to invest in you. I want to invest in your family"*. In the closing remarks of the second televised presidential debate, when asked to say something good about her opponent, she also managed to highlight how important family is for her when she said: *"Well, I respect his children [...] it is something that as a mother and a grandmother is very important to me"*. We have also found this trend in other parts of her speech, when talking about immigration. Clinton worried about families that could be broken because of Donald Trump's policies and mentioned that *"[t]here is a lot of fear"* among such families.

#### **5.1.1.3 Conative Function**

Concerning the conative function, we observe that Hillary Clinton uses the first person plural verbal structure regularly, possibly in order to portray herself as a candidate that is close to her voters and to express a message of unity. In fact, her campaign focused on conveying a message of a united country, as its slogan "Stronger Together" showed. She used this strategy in all of the three presidential debates. In the first debate, we heard her saying *"I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future"*, *"We also have to make the economy fairer"* and *"That's the kind of economy I want us to see again"*. In the second debate, she made similar remarks when she replied to a question from the audience by stating *"I heard from lots of teachers and parents about some of our concerns about some of the things being said and done in this campaign"* and *"I want us to heal our country and bring it together"*. The conative function was also present through the use of the second person, which she used in order to implicate the receiver of the message, as in the phrases: *"We need your talents, your skills, your commitment, your energy, your ambition"*; *"If you help create the profits, you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top"*, and *"I've heard from so many of you about the difficult choices you face and the stresses that you're under"*. This strategy aims at underlining that the voters are important in the election and the future of the country.

#### 5.1.1.4 Poetic Function

Finally, the poetic function is abundant in the rhetoric of Hillary Clinton. This function helps to make her message more pleasing, witty and convincing. We saw her using metaphors to refer to the effects of the economic crisis. She said that many of the Bush administration policies “*created a perfect storm*” and that only in the recent months America had managed to “*come back from that abyss*”. Parallelism is another strategy that we have seen often in Clinton’s speech, such as in the phrases “*Sometimes you win. Sometimes you lose*”; “*zero in taxes, zero for our vets, zero for our military, zero for health and education*” and “*the middle class thrives, America thrives*”. There was a larger parallelism that presented Hillary Clinton herself and Donald Trump as antithetic:

*You know, back in the 1970s, I worked for the children's defense fund and I was taking on discrimination against African-American kids in schools. He was getting sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination in his apartment buildings. In the 1980s, I was working to reform the schools in Arkansas. He was borrowing \$14 million from his father to start his businesses. In the 1990s, I went to Beijing and I said women's rights are human rights. He insulted a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, and called her an eating machine.*

Clinton was using parallelism by alternating her own achievements and Donald Trump’s in the decades of 1970, 1980 and 1990, and she delivered them as antithetic: her achievements are portrayed as successful, worthy and socially acceptable, whereas she accuses Trump of having trouble with the law, insulting a woman and having built his business only thanks to his father’s wealth. Hillary’s rhetoric is also prone to playing on words and puns, such as in the double entendre “*trumped-up trickle-down economics*”, where she describes the Republican policies as false, while making a play on words with Donald Trump’s last name. She also made a play on words in the phrases “*it was a real touch and go situation*”; “*trickle-down economics on steroids*”: “*he goes around with crocodile tears about how terrible it is*”, and “*We're going to pull the country together*”. We also found a simile when she implied that Donald Trump will enact policies that favor the rich. She said: “*Donald always takes care of Donald and people like Donald*”. Finally, hyperbole or exaggeration was also a frequent rhetorical strategy in Clinton’s speeches. She exaggerated when she said that Trump’s “*whole plan is to cut taxes*”, when she recalls that she has “*never seen people as physically*

*distraught as the Bush administration team was because of what was happening to the economy*” or when she asserts that *“There is nothing [...] America can't do”* .

For the reasons given, we observe that the Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton resorted regularly to both denotation and connotation. This is probably the most common strategy to follow in politics, since speeches are more successful when they appeal to both the rational and emotional dimensions of voters. We have seen that denotation is important for Clinton when laying out her policies and describing the evolution and current situation of the American economy. Connotation, on the other hand, was particularly useful to attack her rival and connect with the audience.

### **5.1.2 Speech Acts**

When it comes to the use of different speech acts, we have previously established that, on the one hand, non-literal and indirect speech acts, that is to say sentences whose profound meaning differs or cannot be directly extracted from the phrases pronounced, imply connotations in speech. On the other hand, direct and literal speech acts portray denotation. The latter are reflected in the sentences we have previously analyzed when we talked about the referential function in Clinton’s rhetoric. In the following paragraphs we will analyze the connotation of speech acts.

#### **5.1.2.1 Indirect Speech Acts**

Through indirect speech acts, Clinton expresses hidden intentions implicitly. For instance, when she recommended that the audience should go online and take a look at the fact-checker tools that her campaign was managing, she was not only making a recommendation, but she was also suggesting that what Donald Trump had just said was a lie, and more generally that Donald Trump is prone to lying. One one occasion, she said: *“So we have taken the home page of my website, HillaryClinton.com, and we've turned it into a fact-checker. So if you want to see in real-time what the facts are, please go and take a look”*. Through these words, she is suggesting that she is truthful and honest when compared to Donald Trump, and that the audience should not trust her Republican counterpart’s words.

In another example, when the candidates were discussing energy and environmental policy, Hillary Clinton stated: *“I think science is real”*. At first sight, the sentence is just a declaration of her position towards the science behind global warming, but this



assertion also implies a contrast to Donald's Trump's beliefs. In fact, Clinton also states that Trump believes that global warming is a "*Chinese hoax*". Therefore, through her assertion, she is also accusing Trump of not believing that science is real.

In the second presidential debate, some members of the audience were allowed to ask the candidates questions. When Clinton was asked her first question, she replied: "*I think that's a very good question*". In this sentence, she is expressing her view towards the question by stating that it's a good question and implying that it is an important topic for the presidential campaign, and, at the same time, Mrs. Clinton is praising the woman in the audience who asked the question.

In another example of indirect speech acts, we recall an extract where Hillary Clinton expresses what she considers as an essential difference between her and Donald Trump: "*We just have a big disagreement about this. It may be because of our experiences. You know he started off with his dad as a millionaire. I started off with my dad as a small businessman.*" The most obvious intention of these words is to stress that the candidates' views differ in part due to their families' economic backgrounds. Nevertheless, it is not the only intention in Clinton's mind. During the campaign, she has been portrayed as being close to the political and economic establishment, whereas Trump has been described as the candidate of 'the people'. Through the sentences mentioned, she is trying to alter this view in the opposite direction.

#### **5.1.2.2 Nonliteral Speech Acts**

Finally, we have also found many nonliteral speech acts, where the real meaning of the intention cannot only be inferred from the literal meaning of the words used in the utterance. In the sentence where Clinton states that Trump "*lives in an alternative reality*", she means that Trump lacks an understanding of politics and that he makes assertions that are not a reflection of reality. In a later statement, when Clinton says that her policies will "*go where the money is*", she is telling the audience that she will impose higher taxes on the people with very large incomes. Similarly, when Clinton affirms "*I want to invest in you, I want to invest in hard working families*", she suggests that she wants to enact policies that will benefit the middle class. Finally, in her declaration "*I don't want to walk away from them*", Clinton does not mean she does not want to physically distance herself from factory workers, but that as a President she will take into account their concerns.

### 5.1.3 Figures of Speech

We have already reviewed some figures of speech in Clinton's discourse when we analyzed the poetic function of her rhetoric. We have observed that she uses parallelism, metaphor and simile regularly. Apart from the ones mentioned, we have also found some irony in her speech. For instance, when she said that "*it is sort of amusing to hear somebody who hasn't paid federal income taxes in maybe 20 years talking about what he's going to do*" she probably did not think that what she was stating would be perceived as really amusing; she was actually conferring that such a thing is concerning. Finally, in the extracts analyzed we have found no examples of euphemism, and in a quick overview of the analyses made on Clinton's speech there is no analyst highlighting that Clinton used euphemism as a rhetorical strategy during the debates.

## 5.2 Denotation and Connotation in Donald Trump

Donald Trump has been described as an outsider political candidate that breaks the rules of political rhetoric. His discourse is referred to as a nationalist and populist one. Given his background in business and lack of experience in public service, we expect him to be more bold and connotative than his counterpart, as well as a candidate who conveys a negative vision of the current position of the United States and promotes an idea of change.

### 5.2.1 Functions of Language

#### 5.2.1.1 Referential Function

In Donald Trump's speech we mostly find the referential function when he provides economic data about the United States and other countries, as we see in examples such as: "*Last year we had an almost \$800 billion trade deficit*"; "*I just left some high representatives of India. They're growing at 8%. China is growing at 7%*"; "*we have right now almost \$20 trillion in debt*", and "*We are growing –our last report came out and it is right around the 1% level*". Nevertheless, there are comparatively fewer examples of purely referential sentences, given that he constantly introduces subjective remarks about the topic he is talking. In the sentences "*We're losing our good jobs, so many of them*" and "*Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio. They're all leaving*", a description of reality is turned into an opinion or an exaggeration by noun

modifiers such as ‘good’ and ‘all’. Throughout most of his utterances, Donald Trump seems to subjectively describe reality by saying something is ‘great’, a ‘disgrace’, ‘unbelievable’, ‘beautiful’, ‘tremendous’ or ‘wrong’. For that reason, he only rarely describes policies objectively without stating his views or feelings about them.

### **5.2.1.2 Emotive Function**

Regarding the emotive function, we find that Donald Trump wielded emotions as a way to praise the United States, his own life and personal experience and to describe ‘the people’ as victims. In the phrase “*This is a great country. This is a great land*”, Trump is expressing his patriotic feeling about the United States. He also showed his emotions when he asserted: “*I’m proud of my children*”. In addition, Trump seems to talk about his or other people’s emotions when describing ‘the people’ as victims of the economic crisis of the last decade, as when he said:

*I’ve visited so many communities. This has been such an incredible education for me [...] I’ve developed so many friends over the last year. And they cry when they see what has happened. [...] It is just horrible what has happened to these people in these communities.*

Through such comments, Donald Trump is showing his sympathy for the thousands of blue-collar workers that had lost their jobs due to the economic crisis and the movement of factories to other countries. His comments imply that he will implement policies to help them regain the economic status they had some years ago.

### **5.2.1.3 Conative Function**

Donald Trump cleverly used the conative function for two main purposes: implicating the audience and signaling out enemies. In the same way Hillary Clinton did, we find that Mr. Trump used the first person plural in order to implicate the audience and convey a sense of unity, as in phrases like “*We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States*” and “*We have to repeal and replace Obamacare*”. He also used second and third person verbal structures in order to single out detractors and enemies. These “enemies” can be:

1. Other countries: “*They’re using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China. They’re the best, the best ever at it. What they’re doing to us is a very, very sad thing. They’re taking our jobs, they’re giving incentives*”;

2. Corporations that leave the United States: *“You want to go to Mexico or some other country, good luck. We wish you a lot of luck. But if you think you're going to make your air conditioners or your cars or your cookies or whatever you make and bring them into our country without a tax, you're wrong”*; or
3. Officials from the political establishment: *“They lost plenty of money on that one”*.

#### 5.2.1.4 Poetic Function

When it comes to the poetic function, we find that Donald Trump resorts to similar strategies as his Democratic counterpart. Trump also came up with several metaphors, especially when referring to the economic potential of the United States (*“We have a tremendous machine”*; *“We are going to start the engine rolling again”*). One of the strategies that were most frequent in Donald Trump’s rhetoric was repetition and parallelism. Through this strategy, Trump hoped to stress his point of view. He insisted that *“many hundreds and hundreds of companies”* are leaving the United States. He made a similar point during the third debate through repetition:

*You look at the places I just left. You go to Pennsylvania, you go to Ohio, you go to Florida, you go to any of them. You go to upstate New York. Our jobs have fled to Mexico and other places. We're bringing our jobs back.*

When Donald Trump talked about fixing that problem, he also did it through repetition: *“Companies will come. They will build. They will expand. New companies will start”*. He continued to criticize the trade deficit of the United States with respect to Asian countries using repetition: *“Our product is pouring in from China, pouring in from Vietnam, pouring in from all over the world”*. In longer interventions, when he analyzed America’s economic problems and the policies that are needed to fix them, he once again resorted to parallelism:

***When I watch** the deals being made... **When I watch** what's happening with some horrible things like Obamacare where your health insurance and health care is going up by numbers that are astronomical: 68%, 59%, 71%. **When I look** at the Iran deal and how bad a deal it is for us, it's a one-sided transaction [...]. **When I look** at all of the things that I see and all of the potential that our country has, we have such tremendous potential.*

[...]

*We're going to make a great trade deal. If we can't, we're going to go our separate way because it has been a disaster. We're going to cut taxes massively. We're going to cut business taxes massively. They're going to start hiring people we're going to bring the \$2.5 trillion that's offshore back into the country. We are going to start the engine rolling again.*

Like his counterpart, Trump included playing on words in his rhetoric, like in the sentences “*our jobs are fleeing the country*”, “*energy is under siege by the Obama administration*”, “*we found tremendous wealth right under our feet*”, “*they came out with an anemic jobs report*” and “*[Obamacare] is probably going to die of its own weight*”. Idiomatic expressions like these make Donald Trump’s message more appealing and convincing. Similarly, hyperboles and exaggerations aim at strengthening his points of view. He used this strategy when he said: “*I cannot believe I'm saying that about myself, but I guess I have been a politician*”. Mr. Trump wanted to be portrayed as an outsider of the political establishment and therefore he tried not to be seen as a politician. He also exaggerated when saying that there was “*no growth in this country*”, when he referred to Saudi Arabia as a country that is “*nothing but money*”, when he accused Hillary Clinton of only talking and not getting anything done, when he said that Obamacare “*is destroying the country*” or when he asserted that it is common to “*get shot walking to the store*” in the United States.

Finally, another common feature in Trump’s speeches was the use of metonymy when referring to ‘the people’, a wide and general concept that he used in order to refer to middle and working class citizens, many of whom could have been blue collar workers that lost their jobs after the financial crisis. Metonymy is a strategy whereby a thing is referred to through a concept that is closely related to it. He referred to ‘the people’ on several occasions: “*I have gotten to know the people of the country over the last year and a half that I have been doing this as a politician*”; “*the people of this country are furious*”, and “*all you have to do is go to a great place like West Virginia or places like Ohio which is phenomenal or places like Pennsylvania and you see what they are doing to the people [...]* It's a disgrace”.

When talking about healthcare, Donald Trump was connotative if compared to Hillary Clinton. He was rather hyperbolic when talking about the Affordable Care Act:

*Obamacare is a disaster. You know it, we all know it. It's going up at numbers that nobody's ever seen, worldwide. [...] Obamacare will never work. It's very bad, very bad health insurance, far too expensive, and not only expensive for the person that has it, unbelievably expensive for our country. It's going to be one of the biggest line items very shortly.*

In addition to that, it is important to notice that Donald Trump always referred to the Affordable Care Act as Obamacare. This is relevant because that way Trump attempts to blame the then Democratic President, who Trump says is a mentor of Hillary Clinton. Therefore, Trump regards his rival as responsible for the outcomes of the Affordable Care Act, which he promised to repeal.

### **5.2.2 Speech Acts**

An analysis of speech acts in Donald Trump's discourse shows that, like Hillary Clinton, the Republican candidate's utterances often encapsulated indirect and non-literal speech acts, both of which imply connotations.

#### **5.2.2.1 Indirect Speech Acts**

Indirect speech acts, whereby the intention of the speakers is not directly stated in the utterance, were frequent. For instance, in the first presidential debate, Donald Trump said: *"Hillary, I'd just ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you've been doing it, and now you're just starting to think of solutions"*. In these sentences, Donald Trump is stating that his rival has been a public servant for 30 years, and then asks her why she has not enacted certain policies during that time. Nevertheless, the intention of Trump is to accuse her of changing her mind and setting her beliefs aside so her policies can be appealing to a new set of voters. On another occasion, Trump asked: *"You say who's making these deals?"* Once again, he is not really expecting an answer; he is implying that the deals that Democratic politicians made were bad for the country. In the third debate, Trump uttered: *"she can say all she wants about college tuition"*. This time, Trump is not talking about the ability of his rival to discuss a topic; he is trying to discredit what Hillary Clinton has said about college education. During the same debate, when Trump said *"Excuse me. My turn"*, not only was he stating that it was his turn to talk; he was also asking Mrs. Clinton to remain silent. Finally, when he told his

counterpart “*We’ve heard this before, Hillary. We’ve heard this before*”, he was accusing Hillary Clinton of making excuses.

### **5.2.2.2 Nonliteral Speech Acts**

Nonliteral speech acts, where the meaning of the utterances cannot be extracted from the dictionary meaning of the words pronounced, was also common. When Trump states that the Environmental Protection Agency “*is killing [...] energy companies*”, he does not literally mean that, but instead he means that the EPA policies are making energy companies less profitable. Similarly, when Trump asserted that his policies are going to “*bring back our workers*”, he does not mean he is going to take back workers that have left; he means that he is going to encourage job creation within US borders so that more people can go back to working. Another time, when Trump said that the “*country is dying. At 1% GDP*”, he referred to more growth being necessary to keep quality of life rising.

### **5.2.3 Figures of Speech**

Some analysis has already been made regarding figures of speech in Donald Trump’s discourse. In addition to the ones mentioned in the section related to functions of language, we have found some evidence of irony. On one occasion, Donald Trump asked the debate moderator: “*She is allowed to do that, but I’m not? Sounds fair, sounds fair.*” Even if he says he regards what happened during the debate as fair, Trump actually means the opposite; he actually believes he is being unfairly treated during the debate. Another time, Trump said to Hillary Clinton: “*I want you to be very happy. It’s very important to me*”. Once again, it is hard to believe that Donald Trump really means that he is actively trying to make Hillary Clinton happy because it is important to him.

In the extracts analyzed, we have found no clear evidence of euphemism, but in other parts of the debates there are two examples that went viral during the presidential debates. Once, Donald Trump referred to Mexican and other Latin American immigrants as “*bad hombres*”, a phrase that he used to imply that many of the immigrants from their southern neighbor end up committing criminal activities on American soil. On another occasion, when Trump was asked about some sexist comments he made on television some years ago, he said the remarks were only ‘locker

room talk', an euphemism that expected to undermine the fact that he made an infamous sexist remark.

### **5.3 Main findings and differences between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump**

In this analysis, we have concluded that both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump resorted to denotation and connotation in order to convey their messages and convince citizens to support and vote for them. Overall, we have detected more referential and denotative elements in Hillary Clinton's discourse, and especially when the topic of the debate was the United States healthcare system. Whereas Hillary Clinton has a tendency to explain and delineate objectively some of the policies that she wants to put in place, Trump often introduces subjective and simplistic adjectives and modifiers when he describes the state of the economy and politics. We have also observed that the language functions that both candidates use serve different purposes in each of their rhetoric. For instance, the conative function in Clinton's discourse is meant to portray a message of unity, whereas Trump often resorts to the conative function in order to signal out his enemies. Concerning the emotive function, Hillary Clinton stresses family values and fear towards a Trump presidency, while Trump underlines patriotism and the victimization of the working and middle class. When it comes to the poetic function, we have seen that Hillary is strong in playing on words to make her message appealing and that Trump frequently resorts to repetition to stress his point of view. In the analysis of speech acts and figures of speech, we have found no significant differences. In fact, both candidates have proven to have a connotative style in this aspect.



### 5.4 Table 2: Summary of Main Findings

Table 2 summarizes the main findings that we have extracted in our analysis. Table 2 shows how Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump have used functions of language, speech acts and figures of speech in the fragments of the transcripts we have analyzed.

	Functions of language				Speech acts		Figures of speech	
	Referential function	Emotive function	Conative function	Poetic function	Direct and literal speech acts	Indirect and nonliteral speech acts	Irony	Euphemism
<b>Hillary Clinton</b>	Regularly present when debating policies and the state of the economy and politics. Very frequent when talking about healthcare	Convey family values and fear towards a Trump presidency	Used to portray a message of unity and to attain identification with voters	Making the message more appealing with metaphors, parallelism, antithesis and plays on words	Often present when using the referential function	High use of utterances with additional and implicit meanings	Some use of irony	Not present
<b>Donald Trump</b>	Rare use of purely referential sentences. Utterances often include subjective modifiers like adverbs and adjectives that add personal judgements about reality	Standing out patriotism and the victimization of 'the people'	Used to implicate the audience and to single out enemies.	Making the message more appealing with hyperbole, repetition, metaphors, metonymy and plays on words	Comparatively less present	High use of utterances with additional and implicit meanings	Some irony, particularly in turn-taking dynamics	Present in other parts of the debates.

## 6. Conclusion

Throughout this research project, we have analyzed extracts from the three political debates that took place between the presidential candidates Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in the months before the United States 2016 presidential election on November 8<sup>th</sup>. The objective of the research, which mainly draws from the disciplines of linguistics and discourse analysis, was to identify denotative and connotative elements and strategies in the rhetoric of the two candidates and to compare the results to determine which are the similarities and differences between them. Before the analysis of the speeches began, we had an initial hypothesis, namely that Hillary Clinton would be relatively denotative whereas Donald Trump would stand out as comparatively connotative. Even if the discourse extracts that we have analyzed represent only a small fraction of the wider and more general rhetoric of the candidates, we have been able to obtain several conclusions.

In general, the discourse extracts analyzed, which have been taken from the three widely watched 2016 presidential debates, have proven that Republican Donald Trump is comparatively connotative when compared to his Democratic counterpart. That does not entail, however, that Donald Trump does not resort to denotation or that Hillary Clinton does not use connotation as a rhetorical strategy. In fact, we could see that Hillary Clinton's rhetoric is quite balanced when it comes to using both denotation and connotation. On the contrary, Donald Trump heavily leans towards connotation, given that purely denotative phrases are rather scarce in his discourse. In addition, we have concluded that the different connotative strategies that we have studied serve different purposes in Hillary Clinton's and Donald Trump's speeches. The main linguistic elements that we have analyzed in order to determine so are functions of language, speech acts and figures of speech, and our analysis has particularly focused on the first of the three.

On the one hand, as we have already mentioned, Hillary Clinton's discourse introduces both denotative and connotative elements in similar amounts. When discussing the United States healthcare system she proved to be more denotative. In general, we have found denotation in her speech when delineating policies that she wanted to implement as a President or when providing information about the evolution of the state of the economy and the country. In these situations, she regularly resorted to the referential

function of language. When she was connotative, we found that she used the emotive function in order to portray herself as a person that cares deeply about family and to instill fear about a Trump presidency; the conative function to convey a message of unity, and the poetic function to make her discourse more appealing and convincing through puns, double entendres, similes, hyperboles and repetitions. When it comes to speech acts, we have found that Hillary Clinton has been literal and direct –and therefore denotative– in most of her interventions that were referential and objective, and we have observed that she usually resorted to phrases with hidden or implied intentions through indirect and non-literal speech acts. Finally, apart from the figures of speech contained in the analysis of poetic function, we have also heard her being ironic, but not particularly euphemistic.

On the other hand, Trump relies on connotation more heavily than on denotation. Even though many fragments in Trump's speech are denotative, we have found that he often utters many subjective adjectives such as 'great', 'beautiful', 'wrong' and 'tremendous', to mention a few, when describing a policy or a situation. Therefore, many of his utterances do not qualify as denotative. The rare use of the purely referential function of language, which entails an objective description of reality, was directed towards the provision of figures about growth, deficit or public debt. When Trump was connotative, he used the emotive function to convey patriotic messages or to protest against the victimization of what he refers to as 'the people'. The conative function was used not only to convey a message of unity but also to single out his enemies and criticize them. The poetic function was also often present in Trump's speech, especially through repetition and parallelism, hyperbole, metonymy, plays on words and metaphors. Similarly to his counterpart, Trump often uttered sentences that contained indirect and non-literal speech acts; thus he often conferred additional meanings that were not explicit in his words. Finally, we have observed that he sometimes resorted to irony and, although not in the specific fragments we have analyzed, euphemism, which we consider worth mentioning given that two of his euphemisms quickly became famous and easily recognized by the public.

These findings ought to be confirmed, modified or denied by further research. There is a lot of material worth analyzing that would enhance our knowledge about the use of denotation and connotation by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump during the campaign trail. There exists the possibility that the extracts that we have chosen are not the best

representation of the wider rhetoric of either of the candidates. In fact, the discourse that we have analyzed is part of face-to-face debates, and therefore only one form of political discourse that has a different dynamic to the more usual political discourse that we find in individual speeches, interviews and press conferences. It could be that when analyzing individual speeches, the same methodology used in this research project would lead us to different conclusions.

For all the reasons given, it would be interesting if future research focused on analyzing other fragments of the debates or the discourse of either of the candidates, separately or comparatively, when they participate in other forms of political discourse such as speeches or interviews. Moreover, future research could analyze Hillary Clinton's and Donald Trump's discourse through a different discipline of discourse analysis like critical discourse analysis, which could focus on a topic like gender, race or inequality. Finally, a sociological and psychological approach to the topic could be put through a research that focused on how the candidates' discourse shaped the discourse of politicians inside their parties and supporters in the citizenry or through an analysis of how the public perceives the discourse of each candidate, which could help us understand whether they perceive the discourse of the candidate they support as objective and denotative mainly due to the fact that they agree with him or her.

## 7. Bibliography

- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bach, K. (2002). Speech acts. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/speech-acts/v-1/sections/direct-indirect-and-nonliteral-speech-acts#>
- Barthes, R. (1974). *S/Z*. London: Cape
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Booth, W. C. (1974). *A rhetoric of irony*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chandler, D. (1995). *Semiotics for beginners*. Online version. Retrieved from <http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/S4B/sem06.html>
- Cobley, P. & Jansz, L. (1999). *Introducing semiotics*. Cambridge: Icon Books Ltd.
- Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fuentes, C. & Alcaide, E. R. (2002). *Mecanismos lingüísticos de la persuasión*. Madrid: Arcolibros.
- Halliday, M. (1977) Text as semantic choice in social contexts. In Van Dijk, T. A. & Petöfi, J. S. (Eds.), *Grammar and Descriptions*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 176–225.
- Halliday, M. & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar. Third Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1984). *Ensayos de lingüística general*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.
- Jenkins, S. (January 26<sup>th</sup>, 2017). Post-truth politics will be debunked by online facts. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/jan/26/post-truth-politics-online-facts-donald-trump-lies>

- Kratch, M. (2007). *Introduction to linguistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Kracht/courses/ling20-fall07/ling-intro.pdf>
- Merriam-Webster. (2017). *Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/>
- Mitchell, A. Gottfried, J., Barthel, M. & Shearer, E. (2016). How Americans get their news. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.journalism.org/2016/07/07/pathways-to-news/>
- Montgomery, M. (1992). *An Introduction to Language and Society*. London: Routledge
- Morris, C. W. (1970). *Foundations of the Theory of Signs*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Mortara, B. (1988). *Manual de retórica*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Norrick, N. R. (2001). Discourse and semantics. In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 76-99.
- Open Culture. (2016). Noam Chomsky on Whether the Rise of Trump Resembles the Rise of Fascism in 1930s Germany. *Open Culture*. Retrieved from <http://www.openculture.com/2016/05/noam-chomsky-on-whether-the-rise-of-trump-resembles-the-rise-of-fascism-in-1930s-germany.html>
- Oxford Dictionaries. (2016). Oxford Dictionaries Word of the Year 2016 is... *Oxford Dictionaries*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxforddictionaries.com/press/news/2016/12/11/WOTY-16>
- Politico. (n.d.). Transcripts. *Politico Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.politico.com/news/transcripts>
- Rainie, L., Anderson, J. & Albright, J. (2017). The Future of Free Speech, Trolls, Anonymity and Fake News Online. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2017/03/29/the-future-of-free-speech-trolls-anonymity-and-fake-news-online/>

- Rennie, D. (February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017). Lexington: Protesters are confronting members of Congress in a way not seen since the Tea Party's rise. *The Economist*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21717373-if-gravest-threat-democracy-indifference-then-have-some-faith-donald-trumps>
- Schäffner, C. (2013). Discourse analysis. In Gambier, Y. & Van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies. Volume 4*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 47-52.
- Schäffner, C. (2013). Discourse analysis. In Gambier, Y. & Van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies. Volume 4*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 47-52.
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.). (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sharman, J. (2016). Noam Chomsky: Seeing Donald Trump win reminded me of listening to Hitler's rallies as a boy. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/noam-chomsky-donald-trump-win-memories-hitler-nuremberg-rallies-a7469696.html>
- Swaine, J. (January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2017). Donald Trump's team defends 'alternative facts' after widespread protests. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/22/donald-trump-kellyanne-conway-inauguration-alternative-facts>
- The Boston Globe. (2016). Decoding Trump's and Clinton's speeches. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved from <https://apps.bostonglobe.com/graphics/2016/07/convention-speeches/>
- The Economist. (April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016). Hillary Clinton: Unloved and unstoppable. *The Economist*.
- The Economist. (May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016). The Republican nominee: Fear trumps hope. *The Economist*.

- The Economist. (October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016). Anti-globalists: why they are wrong. *The Economist*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21707926-globalisations-critics-say-it-benefits-only-elite-fact-less-open-world-would-hurt>
- The Economist. (September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016). Post truth politics: art of the lie. *The Economist*. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21706525-politicians-have-always-lied-does-it-matter-if-they-leave-truth-behind-entirely-art>
- The New York Times. (2016). Fact Checks of the 2016 Election. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/us/elections/fact-check.html>
- The Washington Post. (2016). The 2016 Election Fact-Checker. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/2016-election/fact-checker/>
- Tyson, A. & Maniam, S. (2016). Behind Trump's victory: Divisions by race, gender, education. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/09/behind-trumps-victory-divisions-by-race-gender-education/>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2012). *Discurso y contexto. Un enfoque sociocognitivo*. Barcelona: Gedisa editorial.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (n.d.). *Issues in Functional Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Wilson, J. (2001). Political discourse. In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. E. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 398-415.



## 8. Appendices

### 8.1 Appendix 1: Origin of the Speech Fragments Used, in Order of Appearance

The following table shows the origin of the speech fragments that have been used for the analysis, in order of appearance. The first debate took place on September 26<sup>th</sup>, the second on October 9<sup>th</sup> and the third on October 19<sup>th</sup>. The page numbers reflect those that can be found on the transcripts that are included in a CD-ROM attached to this research project.

Fragment	Debate N°	Page
<b>In section 5.1.1</b>		
<i>jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business</i>	1	2
<i>[h]e printed drapery fabrics on long tables, where he pulled out those fabrics and he went down with a silkscreen and dumped the paint in and took the squeegee and kept going</i>	1	4
<i>I was in the Senate before I became secretary of state</i>	3	17
<i>Nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their homes. And \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out</i>	1	6
<i>When my husband was president, we went from a \$300 billion deficit to a \$200 billion surplus</i>	3	17
<i>He has cut the deficit by two-thirds</i>	3	17
<i>We are not dependent on the Middle East, but the Middle East controls a lot of prices</i>	2	35
<i>the price of coal is down worldwide</i>	2	36
<i>We're beginning to see some increase in incomes</i>	3	18
<i>Right now we are at 90% health insurance coverage</i>	2	11
<i>insurance companies can't deny you coverage because of a preexisting condition [...], women can't be charged more than men for our health insurance, which is the way it used to be before the affordable care act [and] if you are under 26 and your parents have a policy, you can be on that policy until the age of 26, something that didn't happen before</i>	2	11
<i>an employer-based system: that's where the vast majority of people get their health care</i>	2	12
<i>I have a positive and optimistic view of what we can do together</i>	2	1
<i>Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this a lot</i>	1	2
<i>because those coal miners and their fathers and grandfathers</i>	2	35
<i>That's why I want to invest in you. I want to invest in your family</i>	3	37
<i>Well, I respect his children [...] it is something that as a mother and a grandmother is very important to me</i>	2	35
<i>[t]here is a lot of fear</i>	2	29
<i>I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future</i>	1	2
<i>We also have to make the economy fairer</i>	1	2
<i>That's the kind of economy I want us to see again</i>	1	4
<i>I heard from lots of teachers and parents about some of our concerns about some of the things being said and done in this campaign</i>	2	35
<i>I want us to heal our country and bring it together</i>	2	2
<i>We need your talents, your skills, your commitment, your energy, your</i>	3	39

<i>ambition</i>		
<i>If you help create the profits, you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top</i>	1	2
<i>I've heard from so many of you about the difficult choices you face and the stresses that you're under</i>	1	2
<i>created a perfect storm</i>	1	6
<i>come back from that abyss</i>	1	6
<i>Sometimes you win. Sometimes you lose</i>	1	46
<i>zero in taxes, zero for our vets, zero for our military, zero for health and education</i>	2	21
<i>the middle class thrives, America thrives</i>	3	15
<i>You know, back in the 1970s, I worked for the children's defense fund and I was taking on discrimination against African-American kids in schools. He was getting sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination in his apartment buildings. In the 1980s, I was working to reform the schools in Arkansas. He was borrowing \$14 million from his father to start his businesses. In the 1990s, I went to Beijing and I said women's rights are human rights. He insulted a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, and called her an eating machine</i>	3	20
<i>trumped-up trickle-down economics</i>	1	4
<i>it was a real touch and go situation</i>	3	17
<i>trickle-down economics on steroids</i>	3	15
<i>he goes around with crocodile tears about how terrible it is</i>	3	19
<i>We're going to pull the country together</i>	3	19
<i>Donald always takes care of Donald and people like Donald</i>	2	20
<i>whole plan is to cut taxes</i>	3	15
<i>never seen people as physically distraught as the Bush administration team was because of what was happening to the economy</i>	3	17
<i>There is nothing [...] America can't do</i>	2	2
<b>In section 5.1.2</b>		
<i>So we have taken the home page of my website, HillaryClinton.com, and we've turned it into a fact-checker. So if you want to see in real-time what the facts are, please go and take a look</i>	1	12
<i>I think science is real</i>	1	7
<i>Chinese hoax</i>	1	7
<i>I think that's a very good question</i>	2	1
<i>And we just have a big disagreement about this. It may be because of our experiences. You know he started off with his dad as a millionaire. I started off with my dad as a small businessman</i>	3	37
<i>lives in an alternative reality</i>	2	20
<i>go where the money is</i>	2	21
<i>I want to invest in you, I want to invest in hard working families</i>	2	21
<i>I don't want to walk away from them</i>	2	35
<b>In section 5.1.3</b>		
<i>it is sort of amusing to hear somebody who hasn't paid federal income taxes in maybe 20 years talking about what he's going to do</i>	2	35
<b>In section 5.2.1</b>		
<i>Last year we had an almost \$800 billion trade deficit</i>	2	2
<i>I just left some high representatives of India. They're growing at 8%. China is growing at 7%</i>	3	18
<i>we have right now almost \$20 trillion in debt</i>	2	11
<i>We are growing –our last report came out and it is right around the 1% level</i>	3	18
<i>We're losing our good jobs, so many of them</i>	1	3

<i>Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio. They're all leaving</i>	1	3
<i>This is a great country. This is a great land</i>	2	2
<i>I'm proud of my children</i>	2	36
<i>I've visited so many communities. This has been such an incredible education for me [...] I've developed so many friends over the last year. And they cry when they see what has happened. [...] It is just horrible what has happened to these people in these communities.</i>	3	18
<i>We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States</i>	1	3
<i>We have to repeal and replace Obamacare</i>	3	38
<i>They're using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China. They're the best, the best ever at it. What they're doing to us is a very, very sad thing. They're taking our jobs, they're giving incentives.</i>	1	3
<i>You want to go to Mexico or some other country, good luck. We wish you a lot of luck. But if you think you're going to make your air conditioners or your cars or your cookies or whatever you make and bring them into our country without a tax, you're wrong.</i>	1	6
<i>They lost plenty of money on that one.</i>	1	7
<i>We have a tremendous machine</i>	3	36
<i>We are going to start the engine rolling again</i>	3	16
<i>many hundreds and hundreds of companies</i>	1	3
<i>You look at the places I just left. You go to Pennsylvania, you go to Ohio, you go to Florida, you go to any of them. You go to upstate New York. Our jobs have fled to Mexico and other places. We're bringing our jobs back.</i>	3	18
<i>Companies will come. They will build. They will expand. New companies will start.</i>	1	4
<i>Our product is pouring in from China, pouring in from Vietnam, pouring in from all over the world</i>	3	18
<i>When I watch the deals being made. When I watch what's happening with some horrible things like Obamacare where your health insurance and health care is going up by numbers that are astronomical: 68%, 59%, 71%. When I look at the Iran deal and how bad a deal it is for us, it's a one-sided transaction [...]. When I look at all of the things that I see and all of the potential that our country has, we have such tremendous potential. [...] We're going to make a great trade deal. If we can't, we're going to go our separate way because it has been a disaster. We're going to cut taxes massively. We're going to cut business taxes massively. They're going to start hiring people we're going to bring the \$2.5 trillion that's offshore back into the country. We are going to start the engine rolling again.</i>	2	2
<i>our jobs are fleeing the country</i>	1	3
<i>energy is under siege by the Obama administration</i>	2	34
<i>we found tremendous wealth right under our feet</i>	2	34
<i>they came out with an anemic jobs report</i>	3	18
<i>[Obamacare] is probably going to die of its own weight</i>	3	38
<i>I cannot believe I'm saying that about myself, but I guess I have been a politician</i>	2	2
<i>no growth in this country</i>	2	20
<i>nothing but money</i>	3	16
<i>is destroying the country</i>	3	38
<i>get shot walking to the store</i>	3	40
<i>I have gotten to know the people of the country over the last year and a half that I have been doing this as a politician</i>	2	2
<i>the people of this country are furious</i>	2	7
<i>all you have to do is go to a great place like West Virginia or places like</i>	2	34

<i>Ohio which is phenomenal or places like Pennsylvania and you see what they are doing to the people [...] It's a disgrace</i>		
<i>Obamacare is a disaster. You know it, we all know it. It's going up at numbers that nobody's ever seen, worldwide. [...] Obamacare will never work. It's very bad, very bad health insurance, far too expensive, and not only expensive for the person that has it, unbelievably expensive for our country. It's going to be one of the biggest line items very shortly.</i>	2	11
<b>In section 5.2.2</b>		
<i>Hillary, I'd just ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you've been doing it, and now you're just starting to think of solutions</i>	1	5
<i>You say who's making these deals?</i>	2	2
<i>she can say all she wants about college tuition</i>	3	15
<i>Excuse me. My turn</i>	3	19
<i>We've heard this before, Hillary. We've heard this before</i>	3	37
<i>is killing these energy companies</i>	2	34
<i>bring back our workers</i>	2	34
<i>country is dying. At 1% GDP</i>	3	16
<b>In section 5.2.3</b>		
<i>She is allowed to do that, but I'm not? Sounds fair, sounds fair.</i>	2	5
<i>I want you to be very happy. It's very important to me</i>	1	5
<i>bad hombres</i>	3	8
<i>Locker room talk</i>	2	5